

**U.S. Pat. Appl. Ser. No. 10/590,236**  
**Attorney Docket No. 10191/2836**  
**Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2009**

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached Replacement sheet of drawings including Figs. 3 and 4 address the objection to the Drawings raised in the Office Action, and replace the original sheet including Figs. 3 and 4. No new matter has been added. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Attachment: one (1) Replacement sheet

**REMARKS**

With the addition of new claims 28 to 33 and the cancellation herein without prejudice of claim 13, 17, 21, 22, and 24, claims 14 to 16, 18 to 20, 23, and 25 to 33 are currently pending in the present application, since claims 1 to 12 were previously canceled. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgement of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper, and cited references.

With respect to the objection to the specification, the specification has been amended herein without prejudice to use the terms electrical and electricity. The specification has been further amended to refer to 12V. The specification has been further amended to clarify that the voltages may be nominal voltages. The specification has been further amended to refer to Ri instead of Wi. With respect to page 6, lines 2 to 6, the specification has been amended to refer to U1 and U2, thereby clarifying the subject matter. The Office Action further asserts that the specification is unclear as to whether U1 = 12V or 14V and as to whether U2 = 36V or 42V. The assertion is not understood since the specification refers to two different possible scenarios, one in which U1 = 12V and U2 = 36V and one in which U1 = 14V and U2 = 42V. There is nothing unclear about this.

Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, the specification, claims, and drawings have been amended herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present objection. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to the claim objections, claims 13 and 24 were canceled and claim 19 has been amended herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present objection. Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as assertedly being inconsistent the specification and drawings. Applicants respectfully disagree. While the specification indicates that, where the second generator is provided with a second charge

storage device, a connection between the second generator and the first charge storage device may be omitted, the specification does not indicate that the connection provided for the second generator to its provided charge storage device is not “established after actuation of the ignition switch and maintained until the second generator has started and is supplying an output voltage,” as provided for in claim 23. Moreover, it is noted that the original claims form a part of the specification and support this feature. Nevertheless, to facilitate matters, the detailed description of the specification has been amended herein without prejudice to explicitly refer to this feature so that it parallels the claim.

Withdrawal of this indefiniteness rejection of claim 23 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 18 to 20 and 23 include allowable subject matter. In this regard, the Examiner will note that each of claims 18 (from which claim 19 depends), 20, 23 has been rewritten in independent form and to include the subject matter of its respective base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner will further note that each of claims 14 to 16 has been amended herein without prejudice to depend from claim 18. The Examiner will further note that each of claims 25 and 26 has been amended herein without prejudice to depend from claim 32, which includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 20. The Examiner will further note that claim 27 has been amended herein without prejudice to depend from claim 33, which includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 18. Accordingly, all of claims 14 to 16, 18 to 20, 23, and 25 to 27 are in condition for immediate allowance.

The remaining rejected claims have been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the remaining claim rejections.

New claims 28 to 33 have been added herein. Claims 28 to 30 do not add new matter and are supported by the application, including Specification, as originally filed. Claims 28, 30, and 31 depend from claim 20 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20. Claim 29 depends from claim 23 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 23. Claim 32 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 20 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20. Claim 33 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 18 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Accordingly, all of pending claims 14 to 16, 18 to 20, 23, and 25 to 33 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the claims as previously presented in a continuation patent application. Further, any disclaimer that may have occurred during the prosecution of this application is expressly rescinded as regards any subsequently filed patent application.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of pending claims 14 to 16, 18 to 20, 23, and 25 to 33 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 21, 2009

/Aaron Grunberger/  
By Aaron Grunberger, Reg. No. 59,210, for:  
Gerard A. Messina  
(Reg. No. 35,952)

**KENYON & KENYON LLP**  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**